

Appl. No. : 09/669,869
Filed : September 22, 2000

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Please amend Claims 18, 40 and 52 as follows. Per practice in reissue applications, amendments are shown relative to the originally-issued claims. Additions are underlined, and deletions are depicted in **[brackets]**.

18. (Currently Amended) The chassis of Claim 13, wherein each mounting flange extends from its respective upper edge in a direction away from the upper portions.

40. (Currently Amended) The assembly of Claim 36, wherein at least one of the upper portions is curved.

52. (Currently Amended) The method of Claim 46, wherein at least one of the upper portions is curved.

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Fischmann for the courteous telephone interview with Applicants' counsel, Glen Nuttall, on January 26, 2004. Issues discussed in the interview were in the context of the Office Action mailed by the Patent Office on January 12, 2004. A summary of the substance of the interview follows.

In connection with paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner and Applicant's counsel discussed the term "rockerable." As discussed, the term "rocker" is well known in the art of ice and roller skating, and one of ordinary skill in the art will know what it means. For example, for ice skates, a "rocker" refers to a curved ice skate blade. For roller skates, the term "rocker" refers to a similar effect of a wheeled skate chassis. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that the term "rockerable" was acceptable in its use in the specification, and agreed to remove his objection to this term. The Examiner has also objected to Claim 9 because of the use of the term "rockerable." In accordance with the discussion of this term during the interview, Applicants believe that the Examiner's objection to Claim 9 is similarly resolved.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). More specifically, the Examiner stated that limitations recited in Claim 5 were not shown in the drawings. However, during the interview, the Examiner agreed that Figures 2 and 3 in fact show "upper portions forming substantially convergent planes in an upwardly extending direction above said one or more web members." Thus, the Examiner agreed that this objection has been resolved.

In connection with paragraph 6(b) of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 18, which is dependent upon Claim 13. In order to provide proper antecedent basis to address the Examiner's concern, the Applicants agreed to amend Claim 18 in the manner presented in the claim amendments listed above. The Examiner agreed that the amendment would overcome the objection.

In connection with paragraph 6(c) of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 40 and 52 because the specification does not require that both of the upper portions are curved. Accordingly, Applicants proposed amending Claims 40 and 52 in the manner set out above. The Examiner agreed that this amendment would overcome his objection.